

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUILDING CODE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
c/o DCRA/BLRA · 941 North Capitol Street, NE, Ste. 2000 · Washington, DC 20002

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

2003 ICC FAMILY OF CODES

PAGE 1 OF 1

CODE	IBC	SECTION NO.	903.4.2	SUBCOMMITTEE AMENDMENT NO.	FLS-4		
PROPOSING SUBCOMMITTEE	FLS	CHAIR	Devlin	PHONE	301/220-1212	E-mail	john_devlin@schirmereng.com
DATES: OF PROPOSAL	04/20/05	BCAC PRESENTATION	04/20/05	BCAC APPROVAL			

CHECK ONE ☐ *Revise section to read as follows:* ☐ *Delete section and substitute the following:*
 ☒ *Add new section to read as follows:* ☐ *Delete section without substitution.*

TYPE ALL TEXT IN 12-POINT TIMES NEW ROMAN FONT

~~**LINE THROUGH TEXT TO BE DELETED**~~ (highlight text, under Format, click font and check strikethrough)
UNDERLINE TEXT TO BE ADDED

903.4.2 Alarms. Approved audible devices shall be connected to every automatic sprinkler system. Such sprinkler water-flow alarm devices shall be activated by water flow equivalent to the flow of a single sprinkler of the smallest orifice size installed in the system. Alarm devices shall be provided on the exterior of the building in an approved location. Where a fire alarm system is installed, actuation of the automatic sprinkler system shall actuate the building fire alarm system.

Exception: An alarm device shall not be required on the exterior of the building when the sprinkler system is monitored by an approved central station, remote supervising station or proprietary supervising station in accordance with NFPA 72.

Anticipated impact of code change on cost of construction (CHECK ONE)

☐ **Increase** ☒ **Decrease** ☐ **Negligible** ☐ **Unknown**

If "Increase" box was checked, indicate estimated range of added cost:

Per 1,000 SF single-family dwelling	\$	to	\$	
Per 1,000SF of commercial building	\$	to	\$	

JUSTIFICATION OF CHANGE:

The installation of a local audible device on the exterior of the building is unnecessary since the building fire suppression and/or alarm system is required to be electrically monitored and supervised affording a greater level of operational reliability than an external, non-supervised alarm device. This provision creates an economic hardship on the owner without a clear justification based on considerations of protection of safety, health and welfare of the building occupants or population at large. The proposed exception eliminates any potential of economic hardship.